

**REMARKS**

Claims 44-62 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 44-46, 48-55, 57, 60 and 62 are amended. Claims 44-46, 49, 52-55, 57 and 60 are amended as suggested by the Examiner. Claims 44, 46, 49, 52, 53-55, 57 and 60 are amended to clarify the features therein in order to further distinguish the claims from the cited references. Claims 48, 50-52, 54 and 62 are further amended to cure grammatical informalities. Thus, no new matter is added by this Amendment.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Hernandez and Examiner Vu in the February 2 and March 8, 2005 personal interviews and in subsequent telephone conversations between Applicants' representative and Examiner Hernandez. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

During the February 2, 2005 interview, the Examiners agreed that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,309 to Anderson has been overcome in view of the Amendment filed on January 28, 2005. The Examiners further agreed that the arguments presented in the January 28, 2005 Amendment with respect to Yamagami were persuasive, however, the Examiners asserted that the arguments presented were not commensurate with the claims.

During the March 8 interview, the Examiners reversed their opinion and asserted that the claims were not distinguishable from Anderson or Yamagami, because the claims were allegedly not commensurate with the arguments presented. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over Anderson and/or Yamagami.

The claims of the present application are patentably distinguishable over Anderson and Yamagami. Arguments in this regard are provided below.

Specifically, independent claim 44 recites a designation device which individually selects the displays that express a plurality of pieces of information to be deleted from among the individually selectable displays, showing two or more of the different types of information stored in association with each other, which are displayed on the display device, and individually designates the plurality of pieces of information corresponding to the respective selected displays as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

Claim 46 recites a designation device which individually selects two or more of the individually selectable displays of a same type of information, based on a user's operation, while two or more of the groups of the list are displayed on the display device, and designates two or more pieces of information corresponding to the selected displays as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

Claim 49 recites a designation device which individually selects the individually selectable displays for the two types of information while two or more of the groups on the list are displayed on the display device, and designates two or more pieces of information corresponding to the selected displays as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

Claim 52 recites a designation device which selects the one individually selectable display that expresses the information to be deleted, which has been displayed on the display device, based on a user's operation, and individually designates the information corresponding to the selected display as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

Claim 53 recites a designation device which individually selects a plurality of displays showing the respective information to be deleted from among the individually selectable displays showing two or more different types of information associated with each other, and which are displayed on the display device, the designation device further designates a

plurality of pieces of information corresponding to the respective selected displays as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

Claim 55 recites individually selecting, with a designation device, the displays that express a plurality of pieces of information to be deleted from among the individually selectable displays, showing two or more of the different types of information stored in association with each other, which are displayed on the display device, and individually designating the plurality of pieces of information corresponding to the respective selected displays as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

Claim 57 recites individually selecting, with a designation device, two or more of the individually selectable displays of a same type of the information while displaying on the display device two or more of the groups of the list, and designating two or more pieces of information corresponding to the selected displays as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

Claim 60 recites individually selecting, with a designation device, the individually selectable displays for the two types of information while displaying on the display device two or more of the groups on the list, and designating two or more pieces of information corresponding to the selected displays as information to be deleted from among the plurality of groups.

As acknowledged by Examiner Hernandez and Examiner Vu during the March 8 interview, neither Anderson nor Yamagami teach or suggest these features. That is, nowhere does Anderson and/or Yamagami teach or suggest individually selecting displays for two types of information (or individually selecting two or more of the individually selectable displays of a same type of information) while two or more of the groups on the list are displayed on the display device, and designating to be deleted the two or more pieces of information corresponding to the selected displays from among the plurality groups.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that each of claims 44, 46, 49, 52-55, 57 and 60, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, is in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 44-62 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

Linda M. Saltiel  
Registration No. 51,122

MAC:LMS/ccs

Date: March 18, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461